Mysore Re-enacting (No. 2) Bill 1973—Introduction

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡುಬಿಡಿ. ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸರಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿ. ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ನೀವು ಹೇಳುವುದೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. I have received an order of the Governor recommending the introduction of the Mysore Re-Enacting (No. 2) Bill, 1973. The President has also sanctioned the introduction of the Bill as required by proviso to Article 302 of the Constitution of India.

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE (Minister for Finance).—I introduce the Mysore Re-Enacting (No. 2) Bill, 1973.

MADAM SPEAKER.—The Bill is introduced * *

Matter under Rule 312 *re*: Non-clearings of Cheques by the Clearing House

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಆರ್. ಶಾಮಣ್ಣ (ಕೋಚಿ).—312ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕ್ಲಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಹೌಸ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು 3 ದಿವಸವಾಯಿತು. ಅದು ರಿಲ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಆದರೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ತಪ್ಪಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನಾದರು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—ಅದೇ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಸಹ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಪೋಲೀಸರು ವಿಜಯಾ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ನೌಕರರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೂಡ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನಾದರು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ವೈ ಘೋರ್ಪಡೆ.—ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿವರ ಇದೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ನಮಗಿಂತ ನಿಮಗೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇಳಬೇಕು ?

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—I am prepared to make a Statement now.

The State Government are not directly concerned with the functioning of the Bangalore Bankers' Clearing House, which is an autonomous body, of which the Manager, Reserve Bank of India is the President and the representatives of various Banks are members.

2. It appears that the decision was taken by the Clearing House on the morning of 15th March, 1973 in view of the boycott programme of the Vijaya Bank transactions launched by the Karnataka Pradesh Bank Employees' Federation as a protest against certain alleged actions by the Vijaya Bank management.

3. It appears that, under the rules of the Clearing House, the clearing house cannot function unless all the member banks are willing to accept cheques from all other member banks. The boycott of the transactions of one bank, therefore, led to the closure of the clearing house.

* * Bill appended as annesure to this Valume.

4. With a view to restoring the normalcy and avoiding further inconvenience to the public the State Government have had discussions with the President of the Clearing House, General Manager, State Bank of Mysore, General Secretary and the Organising Secretary of the Karnataka Pradesh Bank Employees' Federation to-day. The KPBEF representatives, in order to avoid inconvenience to the public have offered to accept cheques belonging to various banks presented by the Vijaya Bank in the Clearing House. In making their offer, however, the Federation representatives have clarified that they will confine their boycott programme to the instruments of Vijaya Bank only when tendered over the counters. The normal operations of the other banks are, therefore, expected to be restored from tomorrow.

5. It has to be made clear once again that the State Governments are in no way concerned with the disputes, if any, which has led to the closure of the clearing house and the steps mentioned above are only with a view to restoring normal working of the clearing house in the public interest.

6. Bangalore Bankers Clearing House has resumed clearance of cheques from the 20th March 1973.

Som information regarding this has also appeared in the Press. Subsequently, I understand that some more development has taken place and the matter is likely to be resolved.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—One question that arises is that it was only the boycott of the Vijaya Bank transaction that is undertaken by the employees and not all the Banks. Apart from this, I know the Bank employees specifically stated that they are prepared to carry on the clearing of the cheques of the Banks. Still why is it that the President of this Clearing House, who happens to be the Manager of the Reserve Bank of India, which is also a Government of India institution with which our Government is also connected, chose to see that the entire clearing is closed leading to so much of difficulty to cuctomers ? Was it necessary ?

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—The State Government is not directly concerned with the dispute, and what is the justification on either side is a matter for them to resolve. We have gone out of the way to see that the public is not inconvenienced. After all, we are not directly concerned, at least my Department is not directly concerned with the distpute. We do not know what developments led to the dispute and what was the reaction to that. The hon. member will appreciate that it is not possible for the Finance Department to take more interest than what we have done. We are not controlling the Reserve Bank of India. Therefore, we have done whatever we could to minimise public inconvenience. It is now open for the hon. member to suggest what more does he expect from any Department of Government ; then we shall consider.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಆರ್. ಶಾಮಣ್ಣ.—ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಕರಣವಾಗಿರುವ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್‌ಗಳು ನಾಗರೀಕರ ಹಿತದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್‌ಗಳು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಕರಣವಾಗಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಧೋರಣೆಯುಳ್ಳ ಈ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ಮಾಡದಂತೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾದರೂ ಏನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ವೈ. ಘೋರ್ಪಡೆ.—ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಡಿಸ್‌ಪ್ಯೂಟ್‌ನ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಏನು. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಯ್ತು ಎಂಬ ಅಂಶ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್‌ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು, ಅದನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲು ಟ್ರೈಡ್ ಯುನಿಯನ್ ಇದೆ, ಲೇಬರ್ ಮೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇದೆ ಮತ್ತು ರಿಜರ್ವ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಇದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕ್ಲಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಹೌಸ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಡಿಸ್‌ಪ್ಯೂಟ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಕೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ನಾನು ಏನನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳುವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—ವಿಜಯಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ನೌಕರರನ್ನು ಯಾರೋ ಕೆಲವರು ಒಳಗಿನಿಂದ ಬಂದು ಅವರು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ದಿವಸ ದೊಣ್ಣೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊಡೆದರು ಮತ್ತು ಪೋಲೀಸರು ಬಂದು ಲಾಟಿಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು ? ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನಾದರು ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮ ;

2-30 P. M.

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—I am not in a position to say anything so far as the law and order aspect of the dispute is concerned. I was only making a statement so far as clearing of the cheques was concerned. To that extent we are concerned indirectly. I am certainly not concerned with other aspect of the dispute. If you want to raise it, I am afraid, you will have to raise it on some other occasion. My statement is concerned only with regard to the clearance of the cheques.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I request the Chair kindly to give me permission to raise both aspect of the question. ನಾನು ಎರೆಡು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು —ಆದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಾರಿ ನೋಡೋಣ. Please rusume your seat.

Ruling by the Speaker

re : Scope of Rule 312 of the Rules of Procedure.

MADAM SPEAKER.—On 12th March, 1973 when some members wanted to raise certain matters under Rule 312 of the Rules of procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly Hon'ble Member Sri K. Puttaswamy raised a Point of Order seeking to know the exact scope of Rule 312. It was his contention that matters to be raised under Rule 312 should have some bearing on the subject matter before the House. He felt that the use of Rule 312 by Members to

raise important matters in the House which have no connection with the Business of the House was not correct. He pleaded that the Members should take recourse to other provisions of rules for bringing such matters before the House such as Call Attention Notice, Discussion for Short Duration etc. I stated that there was considerable force in the point of order raised by Sri K. Puttaswamy and promised to examine the matter in some depth. Several other Members were of the view that if they obtained Speaker's permission to raise matters in the House they could do so under this rule. They were of the view that to raise matters under this rule it was not necessary that the subject matter should have any connection with the Business before the House.

I have considered the whole matter. It is clear from the Rules of Procedure that save as otherwise provided in the rules, no business not included in the list of business for the day, shall be transacted at any time without the leave of the Speaker. [Rule 31 sub-rule (3)]. In other words it is clear that unless an item of business is put on the order paper, it would not be proper for that item to be taken up. There may, however, be cases where certain representations have to be made by members in respect of matters outside the order paper. In such cases the Speaker has to determine whether the time of the House could be taken up for raising such matters. My predecessors in this House and the Speaker of the Lok Sabha have ruled on a number of occasions that no matter can be raised by any member which is not on the order paper without the permission of the Speaker. I find that Rule 312 of our Rules of procedure is identical to Rule 377 of the Rules of Procedure in Lok Sabha. I have looked into the Proceedings of the Lok Sabha where the Speaker of Lok Sabha has permitted such matters to be raised in the House with prior permission, although the subject matter raised by members had no connection with the business before the House. Such cases have, however, been very few and far between, I feel that the subject matter to be raised under Rule 312 need not be one connected with the business before the House, If it is to be connected with the business of the House, it can be raised on a point of order or in any other manner with the permission of the Chair. In such cases no notice is needed. It does not at the same time, mean that the members could bring every conceivable matter under the purview of this rule. This rule should be taken recourse to very very sparingly. Only some broad matters of policy or principles which are urgently required to be brought to the notice of the Government and there is likelyhood of delay if they are to be brought under other rules of Procedure could be raised under this rule. Matters requiring collection of information cannot be raised under this rule. I hope members will bear in mind these principles while seeking my permission to raise matters under Rule 312. I would like to add that there is no discussion as such on such occasions. The member who has given notice and who is

(MADAM SPEAKER)

permitted by the Speaker will state briefly the point. The Minister oncerned may explain the position.

I propose to allow such matters only on one or two days in a week after the day's business.

Business of the House — Announcement

MADAM SPEAKER :— I have to make an announcement to the House. The discussion on the Budget will conclude to-day and the Minister for Finance will reply to the Debate on the discussion tomorrow. Besides the reply to the Debate on general discussion, the House will transact the following Business tomorrow :—

On 22-3-1973 :—

(1) Discussion and Voting of the Supplementary Demands for Grants for the year 1972-73.

(2) Voting of Demands for Grants on Account for the year 1973-74.

On 23-3-1973 :—

The House would take up the consideration and passing of the following Bills :—

(i) The Mysore Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1973.

(ii) The Mysore Re-enacting (No. 2) Bill, 1973.

(iii) The Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1973.

(iv) The Mysore Appropriation Vote on Account Bill.

The Voting of Demands for Grants for the year 1973-74 will commence on Monday, the 26th March 1973.

Budget Estimates for 1973-74—General Discussion

(Debate continued

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಂ. ನಾಗಣ್ಣ (ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷಣಿಯವರೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮಪಟ್ಟು ತಮ್ಮ ಪರದಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ನದನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಪರದಿಯು ಬಹುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ವಾಸ್ತಾವಾಂಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ದೂರವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳದೇ ವಿಧಿಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಮೊಟ್ಟಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೊಸ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳು ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಬಾಂಗ್ಲಾ ದೇಶದ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ತಿಂಗಳಿಂದ ರದ್ದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ